



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

prejudice against an Iroquoian identification of the Westo if facts are produced to establish it. Although I have found that a careful sifting of material leaves very few mysteries in the classification of tribes, some such mysteries do remain. One of these in particular I will mention in hopes that Professor Crane or some other investigator may be able to furnish the solution. This is the identity of a tribe called Tamahita, which figures most prominently in a letter written by Abraham Wood to John Richards, Aug. 22, 1674, detailing the travels of James Needham and the—real or supposed—travels of Gabriell Arthur. The tribe was then in a stockaded town on the upper Tennessee. Some years later they turn up among the Lower Creeks, and a part of them at least lived for a time among the Upper Creeks. The memory of such a tribe, confounded however with the Timucua of Florida, was preserved among some of the Creek Indians up to a few years ago. They may have been Yuchi, Cherokee, or possibly, if the Westo were not Yuchi, identical with that tribe. A key to the solution of the problem presented by them has yet to be found.

JOHN R. SWANTON

BUREAU OF AMERICAN ETHNOLOGY,
WASHINGTON, D. C.

PROFESSOR G. E. HALE,
President National Research Council,
Washington, D. C.

NEW YORK CITY,
March 6, 1919.

My dear Professor Hale: At the meeting of the American Anthropological Association held in Baltimore, December 27, Professor J. C. Merriam, representing the National Research Council, made a formal statement of the plans of the Council in regard to the organization of science, and requested an expression of opinion on the part of the American Anthropological Association in regard to the position of anthropology in the work of the National Research Council.

In consequence of this request and the discussion following it, the undersigned were appointed a committee for the purpose of giving to the National Research Council information in regard to the work actually done by American anthropologists. A statement has been added pointing out the causes for the slow development of certain branches of anthropology.

The committee submitted a number of questions to American anthropologists and attached to this are a number of replies to our circular letter.

The general tendency of the scientific work of American anthropologists may briefly be summarized as follows: It is but natural that in a

country like our own, which contains the remains of a considerable number of primitive people, the historical interest in the aborigines, combined with the ease of accessibility of the remnants of the ancient tribes, should bring it about that inquiries relating to their customs, languages, and physical types should dominate American anthropological research, and that theoretical work should be based very largely upon the results obtained from a study of American tribes. The methods which give the easiest results in regard to these problems are archaeological, ethnographical, and linguistic and for this reason these three lines of inquiry have hitherto predominated in the research work of American anthropologists.

At the same time the necessity for a broader outlook is keenly felt. The Field Museum of Natural History has included in the scope of its work eastern Asia, Malaysia, and Melanesia. Harvard University has expanded its work over Africa. The University of Pennsylvania has undertaken research work in South America, the American Museum of Natural History and the United States National Museum, in Asia, and a few other attempts of similar kind for obtaining a wider basis for research in cultural history may be noted.

The field of work of American anthropologists is also in part determined by the character of the institutions that maintain anthropological work. The Bureau of American Ethnology which forms part of the Smithsonian Institution is by law restricted to work on the natives of America and the Hawaiian islands. Most positions held by working anthropologists are museum positions, and consequently the scientific work is largely restricted to those aspects of anthropology that yield tangible specimens. University positions are on the whole of such a character that the funds necessary for the conduct of field work are not supplied by the universities, but if available at all, come from museums.

Anthropologists have felt for a long time that their work needs expansion, and many attempts have been made to free anthropological research from the restrictions dependent upon the association of anthropological work with museums on the one hand, and from those conditions that tend to give undue preponderance to work on American Indians on the other hand. Attempts have been made particularly to direct attention to African problems, which are of importance to us on account of our large negro population, and also to investigations on racial anthropology among the white and negro populations of the United States. Work of this kind needs financial support, but all attempts have failed to interest the government institutions which command considerable funds, or private individuals, to support work of this kind. There is a

peculiar hesitancy in regard to undertakings of this type, which will not be overcome until more work on a smaller scale has been done. Investigations of this description have been undertaken by American anthropologists and by educators, sociologists, and medical men with anthropological leanings. Recently, biologists have also directed their attention to this subject, but methods applied and results obtained up to this time are quite unsatisfactory. Work on human paleontology is also not vigorously pursued.

The difficulty of giving anthropological research an adequate position in the scheme of the National Research Council is largely based on the fact that the humanities find no place in the general scheme of work of the Research Council. While anthropology must necessarily be based on the one hand on biological science, on the other hand it is intimately associated with the humanities. It is impossible to treat even the biological problems of anthropology without a due regard to the cultural aspect of anthropology, because the forces which determine the development of human types are to a very large extent cultural forces.

The peculiar position of anthropology brings about close contact with a great many different sciences,—biology, geology, paleontology, geography, psychology, history, linguistics, and the whole range of humanities. Coöperation will be necessary according to the particular type of problems taken up, and anthropology will be best served by an entirely free association with different subjects, according to the need of each case.

It is the opinion of the undersigned committee that the appointment of a director of anthropological work, who would have a dominant influence over organized work, would not be helpful on account of the great diversity of subject matter included in anthropology, and might prove decidedly prejudicial on account of the necessity of developing this subject in different directions. Much better results would undoubtedly be obtained by regular meetings of representative scientists, and by the appointment of a secretary who would carry out the necessary clerical work.

Yours very respectfully,

(Signed) FRANZ BOAS, *Chairman*,

ALEŠ HRDLIČKA,

ALFRED M. TOZZER